COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XII. No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1807. [PRICE 10D.

" Did not the keeping of this station breed fear to our greatest enemies, and make our faint friends the " more sure and loather to break? Yea, hath not the winning and keeping of this bred throughout " Europe an honourable opinion and report of our English nation? Again, what one thing so much pre- " served and guarded our merchants, their traffic and intercourses, or hath been so great a help for the " well-uttering of our chief commodities; or what, so much as this, hath kept a great part of our sea- " coasts from spoiling and robbing?"——LORD KEEPER's Speech, at opening the Parliament, in the 1st year of Q. Elizabeth's reign.—Cobbett's Parliamentary History of England, Vol. I. p. 640.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

DANISH WAR.—— The Danes having, not only declared war, but issued orders to their vessels to take and destroy our vessels, it would, I should think, be difficult to give any satisfactory reasons for our not having *declared war too.* Ships and goods taken from an enemy, previous to a declaration of war, are called " *Droits* of Admiralty;" and, in this way used, *droit* seems to mean *forfeiture,* or *prize;* but, why the ships and goods, taken under such circumstances, should not go to the *captors,* as well as ships and goods, taken *after* a declaration of war, I can see no reason. The real truth is, however, that this " *droit* of Admiralty," is a prize for *the king,* who, under an old custom, claims such ships and goods as his own private property, and, accordingly, he claimed an immense sum, which, as my readers will recollect, was taken from the Spaniards, previous to a declaration of war, and which claim did greatly surprise me, because I thought, that, since the nation had taken upon itself to defray, out of its taxes, all the expences, of *every sort,* necessary to the support of the king and every branch and member of his family; this being the case, I thought that these " *droits* of Admiralty," like the rent of crown-lands and other revenues formerly belonging to the king, came, of course, into the public exchequer. I am very sorry, that this is not the case; for, if, upon some future occasion, a grasping or prodigal king were to meet with a set of supple slaves for counsellors, he might, for years, carry on a war, in fact, without declaring war; or, at the least, take care to have the prime of the captures, to sack the first haul of doubloons, and leave the straggling ones to the fleet; upon some *future* occasion, and when I say future, I mean *a long while hence,* because, as must be evident to every one, the qualities, which I have here supposed possible in a king, belong neither to our present gracious sovereign, nor to his apparent heir and successor; upon some future occasion, however, the case supposed may possibly happen; and, as possibilities of this serious sort should be guarded against, I should, I must confess, like to see these " *droits* of Admiralty" abolished, leaving all the captures to be divided amongst the captors, unless in cases of accommodation with the power, upon whom they are made, when, of course, they would be restored to that power.——To return closer to the war with the Danes; I cannot, for my life, perceive any good reason for a delay in answering their declaration of war. What! When we have made a forcible entry into their territory; when we have besieged, and, perhaps, bombarded, their capital, not declare war against them! That is to say, not *call it war* that we are carrying on! This is so grossly inconsistent, that it is impossible not to suspect, that there is some unfair motive at bottom.——Upon the *ground* of this war, or, rather, of this enterprize to sieze on the Danish fleet and naval arsenals, I thought enough had been said before; but, after a week or two of silence, the Morning Chronicle, that steady adherent of the rump of Whiggism, has come forth with a regular pleading against the measure; and, as I really do not entertain for the writings of Mr. Spankie any portion of that sort of contempt, which he says he entertains for mine, I shall here insert this pleading, and shall state, as well as I can, the reasons why, upon this subject, I differ in opinion with its author——" We have, from the first, en- " tertained considerable doubts, both of the " justice and the policy of the attack on " Denmark. It is true, that since the " French revolution, and since the immense " power of France has led her to violate " those principles of the Laws of Nations, " from which she thinks she herself will " never be obliged to seek protection, (be- " cause, like all other laws, the law of na- " tions is for the benefit of the weak against " the strong), the law of nations is treated " by some as a creature of the imagination, " and not at all binding. This sort of ar-

" gument is infinitely to be deprecated. The " law of nations indeed has no impartial " minister to pronounce its judgment and " enforce its decrees, like the municipal " laws of a particular country, but no one " will deny that that established usage, that " general opinion, and the habit of more or " less accommodating the conduct of na- " tions to the recognized principles which " have been laid down in the code of public " laws, have tended to mitigate the abuse of " power, and to afford protection to those " who were incapable of self-defence. This " visionary law, as it is now called, was of " real practical utility; and though it was " imperfect in its sanction, the law of na- " tions received in modern times, and so " largely improved, has contributed as much, " perhaps, as any positive institution what- " ever, to the superior civilization, happi- " ness, and tranquillity of Europe.—There " can be no doubt, however, that if the law " of nations, which is in its nature and end a " restraint upon force, is violated systema- " tically by one nation to the injury of ano- " ther, that other is released from its obliga- " tion to such other nation; for the plainest " reason of self-defence, because no one " can be bound to submit to a rule of re- " straint upon his force, from which his ad- " versary takes the advantage of being ex- " empted. With respect to France, there- " fore, we undoubtedly have the right of " exercising the law which she practices. " This however, does not give us any right " to release ourselves from the obligations " of the law of nations towards others of " whom we have no reason to complain. " Because France has been unjust towards " Switzerland or Hamburgh, we have no " right to be unjust towards Portugal or " Denmark.——What then is the precise " ground of justification of our conduct to- " wards the latter? It is, first, the assump- " tion that France would ask Denmark to " join in the war against us; and, secondly, " that Denmark would be obliged to submit " to that demand. It may be admitted, " though it is by no means proved, or cer- " tain that France would have sought to " draw Denmark into the war; but next, " are we sure that Denmark would have " submitted? It is quite clear, that at any " time Buonaparté could have seized Hol- " stein, but he has not done it; nor did he " even complain of the Danes last Novem- " ber for defending their frontiers and kil- " ling some of his troops belonging to Ber- " nadotte's army, when they came on Da- " nish ground. But because he could do " that, it does not follow that he could have " taken the island of Zealand and the Da- " nish fleet. The loss of Holstein, &c. must " have been much felt by Denmark, but " she knew that in a naval war with Eng- " land, she had to lose more perhaps than " the amount of the temporary loss of Hol- " stein, and it is highly improbable that she " would have yielded up her fleet to Buona- " parté, and gone to war with England to " save Holstein. Buonaparté had no means " whatever of attacking the island of Zea- " land, and a few English frigates could have " secured the passage of the Great Belt, by " which alone troops for its subjugation " could have been sent. Unless, however, " the danger of Buonaparté getting the Da- " nish fleet was most imminent, we had no " right to seize it, merely to guard against " that contingency. The main question of " right then, in the present proceeding, re- " solves into this simple proposition. Was " it certain, that Buonaparté would get the " Danish fleet if we did not take it? Unless " this proposition be made out with the " strongest degree of evidence, our attack " upon Denmark is unjustifiable, because " it is not necessary to our own defence.— " In matters of this sort we ought not to be " satisfied with general apprehensions. It " is clear, that to get rid of our apprehen- " sions we inflict very severe calamities up- " on a nation acquitted of any previous hos- " tile intention. Are we quite certain that " at the bottom of this business, there may " not be a sort of cowardice not very credit- " able? The danger dreaded perhaps was " considerable. Had Denmark joined " France with all her military marine, must " the country have been undone? We " hardly think it. But the right of self-de- " fence, against evils less than utter destruc- " tion, may have justified us. Possibly it " may. But still as fear is a rash and a cruel " counsellor, we should weigh well its ad- " vice. If, in a shipwreck two people are " on a plank which can bear but one, the " one may push the other off; but he ought " to be fully sure of it before he drowns his " companion. So here, before we sack and " destroy Copenhagen, we ought to be " pretty sure that England could not be safe " without the Danish fleet. It is no an- " swer to say, that Denmark might avoid " these calamities by submission; for sub- " mission is the greatest national calamity, " and it is our right to impose it, or the evils " of refusal, that is in dispute.——The " King of Prussia's attack upon Dresden is, " as far as we recollect the incident in very " modern times, nearest to this business of " Copenhagen. The King of Prussia's con-

" duct was considered very unjustifiable, " though he had the proofs of a fact now " unquestionable, that the Elector of Sax- " ony was a party to a confederacy against " him; but as far as at present appears, or " is stated, it was the wish of Denmark to " remain perfectly neutral in the present " war. We dreaded, however, that her " fleet would have been seized and turned " against us, and under the influence of this " fear, we ruin and destroy an innocent un- " offending neighbour! Our conduct there- " fore wants all the justificatory circum- " stances in that of Frederick. Had he " waited for Austria, Russia, and France to " join Saxony, he must have been undone; " but though the Danish fleet turned against " us, might have put us to a little exertion, " it could never have ruined us; while the " fact of its ever happening is exceedingly " disputable. Had Buonaparté pressed for " the Danish fleet joining him, six English " ships of the line could have prevented the " junction. The Danish fleet could not " have been manned in such a compulsive " unjust war as that would have been. It " could not have come into the ocean, and " if it had, it would have been defeated and " taken in honourable battle. It was not " necessary to steal the victory.—If, how- " ever, the law of nations, that system " which, with the imperfection of every " thing human indeed, has so long protected " the weak against the strong, was not be- " fore this utterly abrogated, it is now com- " pletely repealed and annulled. The law " of the strongest is the only law; not that " might constitutes right, which is non- " sense; but there no longer remains in the " most inadequate and corrupted mode of " application any traditional, written, or " acknowledged law to restrain the violence " of power, to correct the inequalities of " fortune, and to assuage the cruelty of the " sword. The justice of nations (and war " has been so called), is no longer adminis- " tered in mercy. It has no discrimination. " It admits of no degrees of penalty. It is " altogether bloody and exterminating. But " the law of the strongest leads to this con- " sequence; because it admits of no re- " straint upon force. It leads to the very " destruction of society; and as it so evi- " dently tends to such disorder, nations " must, after the horrors of universal anar- " chy, and after experiencing the evils of " that state of nature, again recur to those " principles of common interest, which, " while they preserved the independence of " each, established mutual confidence and " common ties among nations, and sustain- " ed, even in war, the relations of neigh- " bourhood and secured the means of recon- " ciliation. Now the temper of the day " proscribes every thing neutral as treache- " rous, and treats every thing not subdued " by our enemy as a possible foe to us. It " aims at compelling universal war, and " rendering entire conquest to the one belli- " gerent or the other not merely a point of " ambition, but of necessity. This frantic " rage would divide the world into Rome " and Carthage; and then to be sure Rome " and Carthage could not co-exist. If such " deadly conflict be necessary, it must be " endured; but our whole policy goes of it- " self to produce that necessity.——This " attack upon Denmark, granting it the ut- " most success, will gain little which might " not have been gained with as little cost " even of men and money. But the con- " tempt of honour and good faith which it " seems to exhibit is the worst circumstance. " The unfortunate influence it may have on " the state of Northern politics, most think- " ing men can easily anticipate. To say " that it has rendered peace more difficult, " without placing us on a more advanta- " geous footing, may, to some, be a recom- " mendation of the policy. But this feel- " ing, as it was very evidently selfish, is now " about to yield to a different view of inte- " rest. The war has been prosecuted upon " very erroneous calculations, not of safety, " but of advantage; and as peace, in all pro- " bability might be attained without any " sacrifice either of honour or of power; " those who lately were most clamorous for " war on mistaken grounds, will very " speedily be as much desirous of try- " ing the chances of peace, having found " those of war turn out so unfortunate."

——This writer sets out with deprecating the argument, that the *law of nations* is a mere creature of the imagination, and not at all binding; but, he has not attempted to shew us, *where* this law is to be found, and he allows, that " it has no impartial mini- " ster to pronounce its judgment and en- " force its decrees." Now, then, if I understand the meaning of very plain words, any thing which has nothing to regulate, or to ascertain its effect, and which does not admit of being pointed out as to its place of existence, is a creature of the imagination. It is very true, that a Dutchman, named Grotius; another Dutchman, high or low, named Puffendorff; another, named Binkershoech; and a Frenchman, named Vattel; have written books upon what has been called, for want of a better name, the law of nations. But, besides that of these

writers, there are no three who agree with each other upon scarcely any one point of great and general importance; their books contain merely the history of what such and such nations have done in such and such cases, together with the *opinions* of the writers respectively as to what *ought* to be the rules for the conduct of nations towards each other; each writer observing, however, that, unhappily, these rules are frequently set at nought.——The editor of the Morning Chronicle says, that no one will deny, "that established usage, that general "opinion, that the habit of regulating the "conduct of nations by the recognised "principles which have been laid down in "the *code* of public laws, have tended to "mitigate the abuse of power, and to "afford protection to those who were incapable of self-defence." Of the tendency of usage, of general opinion, and of habit, we will speak by-and-by; but, why will Mr. Spankie talk of "a *code* of public "laws?" When we talk of a code of laws, we mean something that has a real existence; something that we know *where to find;* something that contains a description of the acts commanded or forbidden, and which takes care to provide a punishment for transgressors. But this "code" of Mr. Spankie's has no real existence; it is no where to be found; no man, or body of men, have ever had authority to make this code; no nation has ever recognized the existence of such a code; and there is no power on earth, either appointed or self-created, to cause its provisions or its maxims to be put in force. Is it not absurd, then, to talk of "a *code* of public *laws?*" And was there ever any thing more completely "a creature of the imagination?" ——But, as far as the writings of Grotius and others have operated as a code of laws; as far as they have had an effect upon the conduct of nations, I do deny, though Mr. Spankie asserts that no man will deny it; I do deny, that they have "tended to mi-"tigate the abuse of power, and to afford "protection to those who are incapable of "self-defence;" and, in support of this denial, I have no need of any thing more than this universally acknowledged truth, that, in all cases, where laws can, with impunity, be set at defiance by the strong, the weak are in a worse situation than if there was no law at all, the law being then, in fact, nothing more than an instrument of oppression. Thus is it amongst the individuals composing a nation, whose laws may be set at nought by the more powerful, while the weak are kept in complete subjection by them; and, thus has it been amongst the nations of Europe, the weak having been checked in their enterprizes, and their improvements in point of power, by rules, which, when incompatible with their own views, the strong have invariably despised. No: it is not this "code of "laws" which has tended to mitigate "the "abuse of power," but the rivalship of the strong, their mutual jealousies, their quarrels with one another, and the necessity, which, for their own sakes, they have, at various times, been under, of affording protection, and even of granting favours, to nations incapable of self-defence. France afforded protection to the American States; England afforded protection to Holland in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; the little States of Germany were, each in its turn, protected by some great power against some other great power, and tranquillity and happiness were frequently promoted thereby; but, in all this, the "code of public laws," of which Mr. Spankie talks, had not even the most trifling share; and. now, when all this rivalship is at an end, when all mutual jealousies and all quarrelling between great powers upon the continent are extinguished by the overwhelming influence of one power; now it is, that Mr. Spankie would hold up, for our strict observance, his "code of "public laws."—But, this gentleman is so condescending as to allow, that, if there be a nation which sets this code at defiance its enemy may also set it at defiance, *with respect to it*; because the latter "cannot be "bound to submit to a rule of restraint "upon his force, from which his adversary "takes the advantage of being exempted. "Therefore, *with respect to France,* we "have, undoubtedly, *a right of exercising "the law which she practices.*" More than this we need not ask in support of the seizure upon the Danish fleet and naval arsenals; for the *law* (if we must use the term), which she practices, is, to suffer no nation to remain neutral with regard to England, if that nation be placed within the reach of her power. After having gone thus far, it is, therefore, something not much better than "nonsense," to talk about our being still bound by the law of nations towards other powers, and especially those within the reach of France; for, it is in setting that law at defiance with respect to *other powers,* and not with respect to ourselves, that France gains "an *advantage*" over us. "Because France has been unjust "towards Switzerland and Hamburgh, we "have no right to be unjust towards Portu-"gal or Denmark." This, with submission

to Mr. Spankie, is not the way to state the proposition. He should have said: Because France has seized upon every port and every fleet and every arsenal in Europe, as far as she has hitherto gone, for the evident, and even for the avowed purpose of annihilating the maritime superiority of Great Britain, Great Britain has no right to seize upon any port or any fleet or any arsenal that may yet remain unseized on by France; and, the proposition, thus stated, I am not afraid to leave to the impartial judgment of the reader.——"The main question of right," says Mr. Spankie, after having spoken of the probabilities and the improbabilities of Napoleon's forcing the Danes to take part in the war against us: "The main question of "right," says he, "in the present proceed-"ing, resolves itself into this simple propo-"sition: was it *certain* that Buonaparté "would get possession of the Danish fleet, "if we did not take it?" Now, in my views of the matter, this question, so far from being the main question of right, in this case, is of very trifling importance; for, the probabilities, in my opinion, are on the opposite side, it being pretty evidently the interest of Napoleon to leave the Danes in the enjoyment of that sort of neutrality, which they might be expected to enjoy while a French army lay upon the confines of Holstein; that is to say, a neutrality which would have been much more injurious to us than war on the part of Denmark, as it would have kept open a passage for naval stores from Russia to all the ports of Holland, France, and Spain, and also for a Russian fleet, if, as there is reason to suspect, that power entertains views hostile to England. The question, therefore, is not, whether Napoleon would have got the possession, or the active use, of the Danish *fleet*, but whether he would have got, in fact, the command of the Island of Zealand and of the Danish government; and, that he would not have been long in getting this, I think, most men will readily allow. The comparison of the two people upon a plank, at sea, is, therefore, inapplicable; for, it is not the possession of the Danish fleet merely that is, or, at least, that *ought* to be, the object of the present enterprize, but the place where that fleet happens to lie, and which place, in our hands, is the key to a very important part of the world. Mr. Spankie, in the anecdote about the king of Prussia, again urges the want of *proof*, on our part, that Denmark would have joined France in the war. I think it is rather unreasonable to call for proof of the fact, that, in one way or another, France would have converted Denmark to her purposes against England; but, all that I want to justify the seizure, is, proof of this: that, by suffering the Island of Zealand and the Danish government to pass under the command of Napoleon, or even by suffering Denmark to retain its neutrality, the Baltic would have been kept open for a communication between Russia and all the numerous sea-ports in the possession of France; and this proof is to be found by merely looking at the map of Europe. The holding of the key to the Baltic is an object of vast importance. With that key in *our* hands, what are the ports of Prussia and of Russia? Not only *there* do we make our power felt. All the nations thither trading must feel it; and, Mr. Spankie may be assured, that, amongst the other good effects of this enterprize, we shall have to reckon a complete *settlement* of our dispute with the American States. He says, in this same paper of his (7th September), "It is re-"ported that Mr. Munro has received in-"structions from the Government of Ame-"rica, desiring him *positively to insist on* "*our relinquishing the rights of searching* "*any of their vessels for men, whatever* "*their rank or condition may be.* They do "not require us to give up the right of "search for *merchandize*; but they declare, "that they will never permit any of their "vessels, *whether ships of war or merchant-*"*men*, to have their men taken out, after "they have left their ports."—— Now, grating as it may be to Mr. Spankie and to my friend of the Independent Whig (who has answered *not one* of my arguments); grating as it may be to them to see these high-spirited friends of theirs give way, *give way they must*; and, when they hear of the affair of the Island of Zealand, they will be ready to hang themselves at the recollection of their folly. Their silly and malicious merchants and captains, assembled at St. Petersburgh, together with certain Russians, for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of American independence, toasted "*the* "*liberty of the seas*," not supposing it possible, that they would have to ask of this hated England (to see the fall of whom they were on the tip-toe) the liberty of even looking at those seas again.——Mr. Spankie, in conclusion, commiserates the lot of the human race, now that we have, apparently resolved to follow the example of France, in setting at nought his much respected "code of public laws;" and, though I doubt not at all the sincerity of his commiseration, I do greatly doubt the soundness of the opinions whence it has proceeded.

So far from thinking, with him, that this conduct of ours, will render war altogether bloody and exterminating; that it leads to the destruction of society; that it renders entire conquest to the one belligerent or the other not merely a point of ambition, but of necessity; so far from thinking thus, my opinion is, it will have a tendency to diminish the horrors of war, to preserve civil society, and to prevent entire conquest by one or other of the two belligerents, that is to say, by France; for, as to our aiming at universal conquest, nobody thinks it, and Mr. Spankie knows, that the fact is not so. France has conquered all the continent of Europe worth speaking of; and we are now endeavouring, by following her example, to prevent her from becoming mistress of the islands and seas. She has laid all her plans for effecting this object; she has even made great progress in the way of preparing ports and fleets; we, by acting upon her example, are endeavouring to put a stop to that progress, and to place ourselves in a situation to say: "if you will be "the sole sovereign of all the land, we will "be the sole sovereign of all the sea. You "make power the standard of right, and so "must we." Now, though I can easily conceive, how this may tend to subject all Europe to *two* powers, I cannot for the life of me see how it tends to subject her to *one*. Rome and Carthage are of great utility, by way of comparison, when we are speaking of two nations contending for superiority; but, until it be made appear to me, that the circumstances of Europe now are similar to those of the time of the wars of Rome and Carthage, and especially until I am shown that Carthage was the undisputed mistress of the sea, the comparison will, with me, have no weight at all in the argument. I cannot possibly perceive any physical or moral necessity of "the destruction of one or the "other of the two powers" proceeding from the principle upon which we are now acting. Acting upon this principle will, if any thing can, check the ambitious strides of Napoleon; because it will soon convince him, that to take possession of countries is perfectly useless with a view to subdue us, which is now the only great object that remains for him to accomplish.——But, it seems that Mr. Spankie has made a wonderful discovery, namely, that "*a peace*, in all probability, "might be attained *without any sacrifice of* "*honour or of power*," and that, therefore, this desperate proceeding was unnecessary. And, is he really serious? Does he think, that we ought to make peace with France, leaving all the ports and all the fleets and all the arsenals of Europe at her command and the sea open for their operations? Does he think, that, with all this increase of naval means in her hands, a peace of two years would not be unto us inevitable destruction? He means, I suppose, that Napoleon would leave us the Cape and Malta, would restore Hanover to our king (its Elector), and would refrain from demanding a surrender of our maritime rights; but, would this place us upon a footing with France; would this remove the influence of Napoleon from Spain, Italy, and the North of Europe; would this afford us a chance of being able to preserve ourselves against his meditated attacks? In two years of peace he would have a hundred sail of the line to bring against us; and, though we should certainly defeat him at first, he would be able to make us exhaust ourselves even by our victories. "What, "then, are we to have eternal war?" The duration of the war depends not upon us, any more than the duration of a chace depends upon the fox; but, if there be any way in which we can put an end to the war, other than that of yielding our country to the adversary, it is the way which our ministers are now pursuing; because in that way they will convince him, that the longer he continues the war, the greater our relative power will become.——But, this single act, of which we have been speaking, will be nothing, if not well followed up. It is to be considered, I hope, merely as a beginning of a new and vigorous system of warfare. Having locked up the Baltic, we should next demand tribute of the Americans, and of all neutral ships, if there be any, that swim upon the sea. The coasting trade of France, Spain, and Italy should be narrowly watched; and, an option might be left with our cruizers to make prize or take ransom. The whole of the seas should be proclaimed to belong to England, which they do in virtue of the same right upon which Napoleon claims the continent, namely, the right of conquest; and, then, when we came to talk of peace, we might grant him a certain degree of freedom upon the seas, in order to induce him to make such surrenders of countries, ports, and arsenals, as would enable us to lay down our arms with safety. This system of acting would, at once, give a new turn to men's thoughts and a new tone to their language. We should no longer hear people describing our country as fallen, as being one amongst the number of those which had become little in comparison with France; and, I am inclined to hope, that the editors of the Morning Chronicle and the Edinburgh Review would cease to advise us

to submit quietly to our share of the humiliation which the nations of Europe have to endure.——But, while I am exulting in the contemplation of what *might* be done, I have very serious apprehensions as to what *will* be done; and, my fear is, that, when, by the present measure, we shall have put a bridle in the mouth of Russia, and convinced Napoleon, that the longer he continues the war the less chance he will have of subduing us, a proposition to make peace will come, that this proposition, eagerly caught hold of by the Whigs and not much less eagerly caught hold of by the merchants and fund-holders, will be yielded to, and that a peace will be made, in which the security of England will be sacrificed to the calculations of traders and to the restoration of Hanover. I fear this, but I do not wish to be understood as believing that any such intentions are now entertained by the ministers, whose conduct, in the case we have been speaking of, has my unqualified approbation. Not only was the conception excellent, but the thing has been well executed, as far as depended upon the councils at home; and, from the publications in the Morning Chronicle, it is very evident to me, that the late ministry would have adopted no such measure; that they would have proceeded in the old course; that, acting upon the principles of Adam Smith and his disciples of the Edinburgh Review (by whom, in fact, they were, in a great degree, governed), they would have given up our maritime rights, as being nothing compared with the profits of trading with France and America. They were full of new projects of sham philanthropy, infused into their minds by the speculators from Edinburgh, who had belonged to a spouting club there with Lord Henry Petty, and who, upon his exaltation, emigrated to the land of promise, and began to quarter themselves upon us with as little ceremony as French soldiers use in a conquered city. This set, one or the other of whom was constantly to be found near the foot of the table of every one of the ministers, had, perhaps, more influence in producing the silly measures of the late administration than all other persons put together. When once a man in whatever situation of life, gives up his ear to another for any length of time, the councils of that other are sure to prevail. "Suffer," says Burke, "any one "to tell you his story every day for a "twelvemonth, and, at the end of the twelve-"month, he is your master." This maxim was verified here, and, by dint of flattery, suppleness, and insinuating importunity, a set of shrewd literary politicians and writers to the Signet had become, in fact, the chief advisers in all the affairs of this great nation, whether foreign or domestic. Their *Review*, as they call it, was still published at Edinburgh, but written in London, the matter of it sealed up and dispatched from the public offices, and, from these very offices, under the seals of the parliamentary reforming Whigs, was actually transmitted to Edinburgh an elaborate *defence of parliamentary corruption*, containing an open avowal, that it is better that seats in parliament should be bought and sold, than that the members should be returned by the voice of the people freely given. The breaking up of this set of greedy intruders was one of the circumstances at which I most rejoiced as attending the dismissal of the late ministers, and, accordingly, I lost no time, as will be seen in the Register of the 21st of March last, to express my satisfaction thereat. The underlings of Pitt were bad enough; it was sufficiently disgraceful to be obliged to submit to their sway; but, to be ruled by a set of writers to the Signet was too much even for an Englishman to endure with any degree of patience.——Mortifying, however, as it was to see these men squeezed into parliament, into commissionerships, into all manner of places through which they might draw their nourishment from the labour of the people of England, still in their influence as to our affairs with other nations they were most to be dreaded. They had Adam Smith's *wealth of nations* at their fingers' ends. They could weigh you our gains, or our loss, to the balance of a bank note. Stored with this sort of knowledge, their more wise but less *expert* and less industrious patrons soon became their slaves; and, if I am not much misinformed, the treaty with America, in which we shall find some of our most important maritime rights offered upon the shrine of commercial gain, was chiefly the work of these northern instructors. I am not without my fears, that they are not yet quite extinguished as politicians; for I perceive, that they are beginning to pay some particular compliments to Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning, besides the sweeping indirect flattery contained in their *defence of parliamentary corruption*. To change patrons they would have no scruple; but I would fain hope, that the present ministers would be of opinion, that those who were the real authors of Mr. Whitbread's poor project, the real inventors of *badges* for English labourers, the real promoters of the conceding treaty with America, will bring no strength to their party; and, if this should be their opinion, Lord Henry Petty must e'en charter

the Berwick smack again and transport his beloved friends back to their own country. ——It is to an opinion generally prevailing in England, amongst impartial men, that the late ministers, partly from their own dispositions that way, and partly from the influence of these disciples of Adam Smith, would have made, as soon as an opportunity offered, an insecure peace; it is to this opinion, in a considerable degree, that is to be ascribed the little regret, which has, at any period, been expressed at the dismission of those ministers, who, while they had completely disappointed the people in all their hopes of *reform* at home, appeared to be upon the watch for opportunities of sacrificing their interests in all concerns with foreign nations. A pamphlet about "*the state of the nation*," written by one of these newly imported politicians, puffed off, at the public expence, as the production, first of Mr. Fox, and next of Lord Holland, and the editions of which were multiplied by the old trick of altering the title page; this pamphlet, published for the purpose of feeling the nation's pulse, contained an epitome of the principles, upon which, as relating to foreign nations, the Whigs meant to act. The public pulse did not beat in harmony with it; for, though the people wished for peace, they did not wish it upon the insecure and disgraceful terms, to which, from the tone of that pamphlet, they must have concluded the Whigs were ready to accede. It was, in fact, this puffed-off pamphlet that gave the first alarm as to the Whig principles of peace and war; and, I may venture to say, that, with the exception of their profligate breach of promise with respect to a reform of abuses, this silly pamphlet did them more harm than any thing else. Good men, whatever they may think of the ministry of the day; however they may abhor their selfishness and despise their capacities, still love the country; still, amidst all their indignation and resentment, wish to preserve that; and, therefore, there were very few persons to be found, perhaps not one perfectly disinterested person in the whole kingdom, who cordially liked the Whig ministry, and particularly after the death of Mr. Fox, whose name had been its great stay and support.——The Morning Chronicle has a little insinuating sentence, in the tail of the article above inserted, from which it appears, that the editor perceives, at no great distance, a state of things, resulting from this new policy of ours, which will induce persons concerned in trade to be clamourous for peace, and a peace, too, such as the writer supposes might, without the Danish war, have been concluded between this country and France. There occurs to me no reason for believing that such a state of things will arise; for, in spite of all the prohibitions that the ingenuity of man can invent and that the power of man can enforce, goods and merchandises, like money, will find their way to the places where there is a want of them, and the only evil arising from prohibitions will be that of enhanced price to the consumer. But, be the consequences to trade and commerce what they may; be the clamours of commercial men what they may, if the ministers persevere in the principles they have now acted on, they will have the support of the nation; and the Whigs are the most deceived of mankind, if they expect to be able to force themselves into the cabinet through the aid of a commercial clamour for peace. All impartial men see, or will soon see, that measures, such as that which is now prosecuting, are necessary to prevent the subjugation of this country; and knowing, as all men must, that it is in the power of our great enemy to render the continuation of these measures unnecessary whenever he pleases, we need be in no fear as to what will be, with respect to our conduct, the final opinion of the world.

Botley, Sept. 10, 1807.

STATE OF IRELAND.

SIR,——The late events on the continent, and their inevitable consequence the invasion of these countries, require from all thinking people a very constant attention to what is passing in, and with respect to, Ireland; because this proposition is incontrovertible, viz. If Ireland is conquered by Buonaparté, England will also be conquered by him. Let then all of us in due time consider the nature of the security that we possess, for the continuance of the connection between this country and Ireland. We have the act of union, our army, and the attachment of the Irish people as the only grounds on which this connection can be said to exist. But, Mr. Pitt declared in the House of Commons, when explaining the cause of his retiring from office in 1801, that he thought the emancipation of the Catholics necessary to complete the measure of Union. (Woodfall, v. 14.161.) We, therefore, have his authority for the imperfect nature of our tenure of Ireland by the Act of Union. If we look to our army in Ireland, we shall find that also a very imperfect title to this valuable country; that part of it which is composed of English troops, consisting of about 8000 men, is certainly as

good a force as can be desired; but, if England is herself invaded or seriously threatened, these would of course be withdrawn; and then Ireland would remain to be defended by her own militia, and her own volunteers. Of the Irish militia it is unnecessary to say more, than that the whole of the men, with some trifling exceptions, are Catholics, and that they, not being under the control of the priests, or commanded by Catholic officers, are of all the Catholics of Ireland the most likely to make mistakes, (as two regiments before did at Cantlebar), if opposed to a French force. The volunteers of Ireland proved themselves before the Union the most loyal subjects of his Majesty. I hope that that measure has not produced any alteration in their sentiments, though I must confess that I have very serious apprehensions that they still abhor and detest it. Under these circumstances it is that our army in Ireland is somehow or other to be equal to cope with a French force, whenever such a force may land; but to me it does appear impossible that such an army could stand a week before 10,000 French soldiers. If we look to security in the loyalty of the people of Ireland to the connection with Great Britain, as a sufficient protection of the continuance of that connection, I fear, with Mr. Grattan, that we shall be greatly disappointed. I do not mean to accuse the Irish nation of a want of loyalty to their king or country, but I cannot help judging of the extent of it that animates it from past and recent circumstances. I begin with those of 1798. The report of the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Commons informs us, that the rebellion of this year commenced in the North, and that nearly the whole body of the Presbyterians were concerned in it; that the Catholics were afterwards invited to join the Presbyterians; that they did so, and, finally, that nearly all the Catholics of Ireland were also concerned in it. From this authority we may infer that 9-10ths of the population of Ireland were in 1798 in open rebellion against the connection with Great Britain, taking the population at 5 millions, the Catholics at 4 millions, and the Presbyterians at ½ a million, an inference that entirely agrees with the statements of Lord Clare, Dr. Duigenan, Deputy Birch, Lord Limerick, and Mr. Giffard, and of all those eminent characters who oppose emancipation and advise martial law. This being the state of things in Ireland in 1798, let those persons answer these two questions who now maintain that we can defend Ireland without conceding to the Catholics. 1st. Has any thing happened since 1798 to change the sentiments of these 9-10ths of the people from a wish to separate the two countries, into a wish to see them more firmly connected? 2dly. Has any thing happened since 1798 to change the sentiments of the remaining 1-10th, who shed their blood so profusely and loyally in defence of the connection, and to induce them to become less anxious to uphold and support the connection? To the first question every candid man must answer by an unqualified negative. Nothing has happened that can have conciliated the mind of the disaffected of Ireland. But, on the contrary, when, at length, a parliament and a ministry existed favourable to their views, because they were so, both have been dissolved.—To the second question he must answer: yes. Those loyal Protestants who stood firm in the hour of danger, who enabled us to maintain the connection with Ireland, have had great reason to complain of our conduct towards them: we forced the measure of union upon them in spite of their attachment to their parliament, and the rights that we acknowledged in 1782 to belong to them. We undertook to give them peace by the Union; they have already experienced the horrors of one insurrection in their own metropolis, and they are still exposed to all the horrors of religious feuds and divisions. And can we, then, expect to derive from the Irish all the aid of ardent loyalty in protecting our interests, and opposing our enemies? The delusion is too great to exist one moment in the weakest understanding; the truth is, we must conciliate Ireland or Ireland will be lost. God grant that the same blind and obstinate policy which has influenced all public measures during a long period of time may not deprive us of Ireland, as it before tore from us our American possessions. The conduct of the present ministers bears so strict an analogy to the mad policy of those who governed in the American war, that I cannot refrain from referring to it. What was their conduct with regard to America? Whose counsels did they despise? What measures did they adopt? What issue did they produce? They despised the counsels of Mr. Burke, who advised conciliation. They adopted measures of coercion, and a military system of government. They lost America; and so will these ministers, in the same manner, lose Ireland, if they neglect, in time, to avail themselves of an unqualified concession to the Irish Catholics of their just and natural rights.——I have the honour to be, &c.

MENTOR.

July 31, 1807.

IRISH INSURRECTION BILL.

SIR,—The debate which took place in the House of Commons on the third time of reading the bill for suspending the constitution in Ireland, affords another melancholy proof, if any further proof were wanted, of the mode in which the present ministers mean to govern Ireland; and it affords a still more melancholy spectacle of the weakness of human nature, in the speech of a great patriot on that memorable occasion. Mr. Grattan finding himself called upon too loudly to be silent, in order to account for his approbation of this bill on a former night, at length declared, though he did not venture to disclose his authority, "*that he had been told*, there was a French party in Ireland who were ready to avow themselves the moment the enemy reached the Irish shore." And, yet, oh, most lamentable inconsistency! in the very next sentence, he declares, that he does not impute to his countrymen any determined design to destroy the fundamental policy of British connection. "But," says he, "I still assert there is a French party in Ireland;" he then resorts to the old Pitt argument, that by suspending the constitution it will ultimately be preserved. He ought rather to have said, "if there is such a party, disarm them, by improving the condition of the people, and leaving them no temptation to seek for foreign aid." Is it possible, that such an instance of inconsistency can exist in human nature, as that a man, who, in the very heat of a rebellion, warmly espoused the cause of those whom he termed his injured countrymen, and was himself within an inch of being falsely accused, should, all at once, and without producing any satisfactory motive for his conduct, join in the very measures he has so long and so uniformly reprobated; and at length prefer the desperate mode of governing by force, to that of redress and conciliation: is it possible that Henry Grattan can have made the speech imputed to him in the papers of Tuesday, July 28th? For God's sake, let him declare how the situation of Ireland is different now from what it was in 1798. What boon, what favour, what concession have the Irish received from the English government, to make them more attached to it now than they were then. I say this, supposing that there is a French party in Ireland, which I do not believe, for I am verily and truly of opinion, that notwithstanding all the Irish do suffer, and have suffered, there is not a body of men in the whole country of an hundred strong, that would any where join the French on their landing, because they know that the French would treat them worse than they are now treated. The state of Ireland, from the time of Henry 2d. to the present moment, I have always commiserated, and till I see a disposition on the part of the English government to redress her grievances, and to govern her by kindness rather than by force, I shall applaud every lawful effort she makes to obtain what she has so long in vain attempted to obtain, either as a right or a favour. The stupifying authority of a great name must have been excessive, when only eight members could be found in the House of Commons to vote against a bill for which not one atom of necessity was produced, and without one promise being given, that it was merely a measure of precaution, preparatory to more lenient and conciliatory treatment.—— Yours,——W. BURDON.——*Hartford, near Morpeth.*

IRISH CATHOLICS.

SIR,——Your second letter to Mr. Perceval, and the letter of Civis in the last number of your Register, have put the Catholic Question in so clear a point of view, that until some reply shall be given to your remarks, I shall suppose that they carry general conviction with them. I would not, therefore, again trouble you upon this subject, were it not to introduce an anecdote in very modern history, which proves that Mr. Pitt was not the first statesman who conceived an idea of an union with Ireland, and Catholic emancipation, which ought, in my opinion, to have been one and the same measure.——In the appendix to Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, he relates the following anecdote, as he calls it: "It was "intended, in April of the year 1776, that "the late earl of Rochford, with whom I "had the honour to live more like a brother "than a friend, should succeed the Earl "of Harcourt in the government of Ire"land. Lord Rochford shewed me his "Majesty's note about it, and said he had "asked time from his royal master to con"sider. He told me his reason for doing "so was, that as continual residence in "Ireland for three years, was the under"stood condition of his going there, he "could not submit, at his age, to so long "an exile, unless he could do some great "good there, and get some great fame: "that two objects occurred to him; the "one, to procure a repeal of the penal "laws against Roman Catholics, and the "other to bring about an union with Ire"land: that both seemed visionary, and "yet he could not get them out of his head:

" that the dearest friend he had in the " world was Lord Harcourt, and that he " would be obliged to me, if I would go " over to Ireland, let Lord Harcourt know " the offer which he (Lord Rochford) had " got, his hesitation, and his two views, " and receive Lord Harcourt's opinions and " reasons on those views, which could be " better done by conversation than by let- " ters. When I delivered my letter to the " Lord Lieutenant, he smiled, and said, " " a Nassau may do in this country what I " cannot; and Rochford is frank and open, " and will please the Irish. But what you " come about requires much talking over." " I staid a week with him, at his country " house. With regard to the penal laws, " he thought there was not much diffi- " culty; that the Roman Catholics were " all on the side of England, and of the " king of England, in the American war; " and that very good use might be made of " them in the course of it; and there are " men now serving, high both in church " and state, who remember the conversa- " tions on that head, and that they thought " on it as he did. But with regard to the " other object, Lord Harcourt thought " there were great difficulties, though per- " haps not insurmountable."——I will not continue the extract—Lord Harcourt proposed that 100 commoners should represent Ireland, and 40 peers; but supposed it would require time to persuade the Irish nation to consent to an union. With regard to the repeal of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics, there seems to have been a general concurrence, in 1776; and though Mr. Pitt, when he effected the union in 1801, could not promise, what he had not the power of himself to perform, yet no rational man in Ireland could suppose, that he would have authorised Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh to give the assurances which they did give to the leading Roman Catholics, unless he had previously known his Majesty's sentiments on the subject. Such, however, appeared to be the case. The fact stated by Lord Harcourt that the Roman Catholics were all on the side of England in the American war, we all know to be true; and that they were of essential service is also true. But if it was of importance in that day that they should side with England, of how much more importance is it that they should to a man do so now. What has been left undone by senseless bigotry, since the late ministers were turned out, to provoke the Catholics to acts of indiscretion at least, if not to drive them to desperation; for, as you very justly remark, no addresses were presented, no clergyman thought the church in danger by Lord Howick's bill, until it was clear the late ministers had no chance of being restored to their offices. Much praise is bestowed on the Roman Catholics of Ireland for their moderation under the unmerited abuse which has been levelled at them. But it is a mistake to suppose that this moderation is the result of apathy, or from their not feeling as they ought after such provocation. They have a confidence in the good sense of the people of England, who, though they may be misled for a time by the arts of designing men, will soon be ashamed of their own conduct. Indeed, I believe a very great majority of those who joined in the cry of " No Popery," are already ashamed of themselves for having joined in it.

A PROTESTANT, BUT NO BIGOT.

7th June, 1807.

POLICE MAGISTRATES.

SIR,—The impartiality and justice which form so prominent a feature in your excellent Weekly Publication, will, I have not any doubt, secure the insertion of an answer to the attack made by the Kentish Magistrate on that very useful body of men, the Police Magistrates.—The first charge advanced by your correspondent is, that at a contest for a choice of treasurer of the county for Surrey some years ago, the police magistrates interfered, to the extreme disgust of the country gentlemen. Now, Sir, with regard to the interference of police magistrates, I see no objection to that, provided it be not done in an illegal way, or the influence of office be not unduly made use of. What reason or justice is there in excluding a police magistrate from exercising a right which he has in common with his fellow citizens? If the office of magistracy had been debased by its influence being used illegally or unduly, why not bring the offender to justice in the same manner you would any other criminal? " But this has been done to the extreme disgust of country gentlemen, and whatever excites their disgust must be wrong." This appears to be the argument of the Kentish Magistrate; but, I deny that an act which causes disgust in country gentlemen, must necessarily be wrong. You, Mr. Cobbett, have assisted in tearing away the veil which covered the abuses of the state, and have discovered naked to the public view their horrible deformities. This manly and patriotic conduct has excited disgust, great disgust amongst country gentlemen, I mean such of them as have grown rich by public plunder, or who thrive by that disease which you seek

to cure (and towards which exposure is the first step; for before proper remedies can be applied towards the cure of a disease, you must be acquainted with its nature). And country gentlemen of this description are the persons who have most influence in county affairs. It therefore does not by any means follow of necessity, that to excite disgust in country gentlemen is to do wrong. And, I have my suspicions that in the instance alluded to, though I have not any other knowledge of the transaction than what is furnished by your correspondent, that the country gentlemen (by which expression I mean the description of them above alluded to) found an opposition to their views to which they had previously received implicit obedience. All before was snug and comfortable. They sailed on a smooth sea, not a breeze was stirring of public spirit to impede their course. It is, therefore, extremely natural that the gale blown up by the police magistrates, should have excited something like dissatisfaction in the minds of the country gentlemen. However this may be, Mr. Cobbett, and supposing the conduct of the police magistrates to have been as bad as the nature of the case could possibly admit of, can *your correspondent* unblushingly present the accusation of undue interference at elections. It is a rule in our courts of law, that a suitor for redress must come with clean hands. Then shall a *person who classes himself with the magistrates of Middlesex* obtain redress *through your Register* on the ground of improper interference at elections? The conduct of the magistrates on that occasion was such, that it no sooner presents itself than all other acts of that nature are lost. The stars attract attention, but no sooner does the sun make his appearance than they vanish from the view. "But independently of the impropriety of such interference, it is improper and alarming that persons appointed, paid by, and removeable at the will of the crown, should act, much more preside, at the sessions of those counties where their offices are situated; their so doing not only weakens, (I might say destroys) the benefit of an appellant jurisdiction, but lessens the magistracy in the eyes of the people." This, Sir, is your correspondent's statement, but what impropriety or alarm can arise, I confess I am utterly at a loss to conjecture, unless he means that if a person who holds a place under the crown, should follow the dictates of his own judgment when opposed to the interests of the crown, he will receive his dismissal. And, therefore, it is to be apprehended that he will not act conscientiously in his office. A pretty compliment this for a magistrate, a servant of the crown, to pay to his master! An associate of the magistrates of Middlesex too, alarmed at magisterial influence being improperly applied! Your correspondent has put the signature of a Kentish Magistrate to his letter; but, I suspect that he is not entitled to the character which he has assumed, or he never would have been ignorant that the charges which he has brought against the police magistrates, apply with equal force to the county magistrates. Are not the county magistrates appointed by, and removeable at the mere will of the crown, equally with the police officers? And do not county magistrates preside at sessions to which appeals from their acts must come, and where persons whom they have committed, and against whom they have received *ex parte* evidence must be tried? Your correspondent also states, that he has been at the Middlesex sessions when police magistrates *exclusively* occupied the Bench? Is not this a strong argument in favour of police magistrates? Does it not show that county magistrates neglect the duties of their office, and prove the necessity that persons on whom more reliance can be placed should have a power co-extensive with themselves? "But when they attend," it is objected "that they have undisputed powers of the bench." This I consider to be the effect of superiority of mind, which ought to give them the ascendancy. That they are superior in understanding, cannot be denied. The discovery of the guilt of Patch, who was convicted of murdering his master, proves the assertion. And many other instances might be adduced, but one is sufficient. It is foreign from my intention to enter into a discussion of the merits and demerits of our police system, for demerits I admit it has, though not of the nature mentioned by your correspondent. I mean merely to confine myself to answer the charges advanced by your Maidstone correspondent.—I am, Sir, yours.——R. R———E.

BALLOT SYSTEM.

Sir,——I have read with peculiar satisfaction the remarks in your last paper on the Ballotting System. I beg leave to observe, that whenever a ballot takes place in the metropolis, a gang of notorious swindlers immediately publish pompous bills and advertisements, and open offices in different parts of the town, under pretence of insuring substitutes for those who are so unfortunate as to be drawn. Many of these fellows are actually confined in the King's Bench and Fleet Prison, who, with the assistance o an

active, roguish agent out of doors, manage their business so adroitly as to extort some thousands from the honest and industrious part of the community. These swindling adventurers have no intention of satisfying their claimants. Their only object is to receive all they can, and the moment the ballot commences is the signal for winding up accounts, shutting up their offices, and decamping with the cash. It is *a fact, that, at the period when the army of reserve was set on foot, a notorious swindler, now dead, made more than £1,500 in about five months, by robbing livery servants, mechanics and shopmen of their hard earnings, without finding or ever intending to find, a single substitute for any person who insured with him.* One High Constable realized a handsome fortune by insuring; and now lives in the stile of a nobleman. When Mr. Yorke, as Secretary at War, was apprized of such improper practices, he endeavoured to stop them by a clause inflicting a penalty of £100, on every High Constable taking insurances. This, permit me to say, has been completely evaded. A confidential person is now employed, who, with the assistance of some of the clerks, acting under the court of lieutenancy, realise very considerable sums without the possibility of detection; the opportunities they have of exonerating their subscribers from the effects of the ballot, (at least for a time) must be evident to every one. The drawing takes place. Some of their *customers* are fixed on. The return of *non est inventus* on the back of the precept is received as a matter of course without any further investigation.—The penalty is now doubled. *Twenty pounds* instead of *ten pounds*. Of course, all the tricks alluded to will be played off with redoubled vigour. ——Yours.—A. C. R.

PUBLIC PAPER.

WAR WITH DENMARK.—*Declaration published by the Court of Denmark against England.*

All Europe is acquainted with the system which Denmark has followed, during a period of 15 years of war and disturbance, with unceasing perseverance. The rigid observance of a free and impartial neutrality, and the conscientious fulfilment of all the duties belonging thereunto, have formed the object of all its wishes and all its efforts. The Danish Government, in its relations and connections with other States, has never lost sight of that simplicity, which was inseparable from the purity of its sentiments and its love of peace, and which it cannot be suspected of having once changed or debilitated. Hitherto Providence has blessed our undertakings. Without injustice, without any ground of reproach from any of the other Powers, we succeeded in keeping up a good understanding with the whole of them. This state of peace and tranquillity is suddenly annihilated. The English Government, after having long neglected its own interests by a shameful inactivity, and after having betrayed its allies into a vexatious and uncertain struggle, has suddenly developed all its power and activity, to attack a neutral and peaceable State, without any complaint against the same. The means for dissolving the ancient and sacred connections which united Denmark to Great Britain, have been prepared with as much secrecy as promptitude. The Danish Government saw the English ships of war upon their coast without even the conjecture that they were to be employed against Denmark. The island of Zealand was surrounded, the capital threatened, and the Danish territories violated and injured, before the Court of London had made use of a single word to express the hostility of its feelings. This hostility, however, soon became evident:—Europe will with difficulty believe what it will hear. The basest, the most violent and cruel object which could ever have been taken up, has no other foundation than some pretended information, or rather that of a mere rumour of an attempt, which, according to the English Ministry, was to have taken place, in order to draw Denmark into an hostile alliance against Great Britain.—Upon these pretended grounds, which the least degree of discussion immediately would have shewn as being founded upon arbitrary measures alone, the English Government declared to the Court of Denmark, in the most imperious manner, that in order to secure its own interests, and to provide for its own safety, it could leave Denmark no other choice than a war, or a close alliance with Great Britain. And what kind of alliance did they offer? An alliance, the first guarantee of which, as a pledge of the subjection of Denmark, was to have delivered up all her ships of war to the British Government. There could be no hesitation as to the alternative that was to be adopted. This opening being made, as scandalous in its offers as in its menaces—as offensive in the manner as in the thing itself—left no room for negociation. The most justifiable and rooted disdain naturally absorbed every other feeling. Placed between danger and dishonour, the Danish Government had no choice. The war commenced: Denmark was by no means blind to the dangers, to the losses with which she

was threatened by this war. Attacked in the most unexpected and dishonourable manner, exposed in a separate province, and in a manner cut off from all the means of defence, and forced into an unequal contest, she could not flatter herself with escaping a very material injury. Unspotted honour, however, still remained for her to defend, as well as that reputation which she had earned as the price of her upright conduct.—Denmark, therefore, flatters herself that, on the part of the Powers of Europe, she will not appeal in vain. Let impartial Cabinets judge whether England was under the political necessity of sacrificing another State without hesitation, to her own safety; a State which had neither offended nor provoked her. Depending upon the justice of her cause, trusting in Providence, and in the love and loyalty of a people to a Prince, whose mild sceptre, under Providence, is swayed over an united, brave, and faithful people, the Danish Government flatters itself that it will be able to acquit itself without weakness, of the hard and painful task which has been imposed upon it by necessity. The Government of Denmark believes it has a right to reckon upon the interest and justice of the Cabinets of Europe, and they particularly hope for the effects of the same on the parts of those illustrious Sovereigns, whose objects and alliances have served the English for a pretext, and to give a colour to the most crying act of injustice, and whose object is to offer England the means of making a general atonement for an act of violence, which, even in England, every noble and generous mind will disown; which deforms the character of a virtuous Sovereign, and will ever remain a scandal in the annals of Great Britain.

FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPER.

BUENOS AYRES.—*Manifesto of his excellency the Viceroy of Peru, on the Capture of Buenos Ayres by the English.*

[From the Peruvian Minerva.]

Although I am convinced, the perusal of the three proclamations, published at the city of Buenos Ayres by the English General Beresford, must have filled with indignation the breasts of all his Majesty's loyal subjects, and particularly of those who enjoy the happiness of inhabiting this metropolis, so much favoured and distinguished by our Sovereigns; yet I cannot refrain from indulging myself in pointing out to my countrymen, the venom, hidden under the hypocritical professions of the enemy, therein contained; for which purpose, without recurring to any other arguments, I shall confine myself solely to a retrospect of the recent atrocious conduct observed by that nation in every quarter of the globe. Years after years have set in and passed, during which all Europe has witnessed the English Government using every means it can invent, for cementing and propagating its detestable tyranny, availing itself of every circumstance favouring such a purpose; stooping to practices the most vile and infamous, setting aside the most sacred principles of the rights of man, and trampling upon all the usages and customs, for many ages universally received and observed amongst civilized nations. Far from proceeding either in carrying on war or negociating peace, with that noble frankness and good faith, the characteristics of nations generous and brave, it recurs to dark artifices of fiction and seduction, to dazzle and corrupt the unwary, who are weak enough to trust and confide in his perfidious promises. Such is the object of the three proclamations which I have mentioned; to lull to sleep the understanding of the inhabitants of Buenos Ayres, with hopes of an imaginary happiness; to blindfold them, that they may not perceive the abyss of evil which surrounds them: to cover, as with a garland of flowers, the iron chains which their oppressors have prepared for them; to stupify the native energy of those active Spaniards; to alienate from their hearts, if it is possible, the love, the fidelity, and gratitude they owe to the most benevolent and just of all Monarchs; to prevail upon them, for ever, to lay down their arms, nor think of avenging themselves and retrieving their lost honour, but solely to aspire to the felicity of being numbered among the vilest slaves of the Tyrant of the Seas. From these motives, they speak of the great advantages which they pretend would result from an alliance with Great Britain: under that Government, they say, oppression is unknown; they promise immediately to free their commerce from the heavy duties and imposts to which it has been subjected, to respect the Catholic religion and its holy Ministers, and that the local laws and national customs shall remain untouched: and they conclude with stating, that their only object is to protect the Eastern coasts of South America, and render it a country the most prosperous in the universe. But where is the man of sense and judgement, who does not immediately discover, under such affected expressions, the vile language of hypocrisy and fiction, so foreign to the intrepid soldier, and natural only to the cowardly legions of those sordid islanders? Where is the man

whose blood does not boil on hearing the sacred names of protection, humanity, and benevolence, pronounced by a government, stained with recent robberies, perfidies, and murders? by a goverment which does not cease sowing the seeds of discord and rebellion every where; by a government which has so lately before our eyes kindled a fire in the fairest part of the globe [alluding to Europe], whose provinces we have so recently seen inundated with streams of the blood of its inhabitants?—by a government, which has so basely forsaken its allies, by hastily withdrawing its troops from all those parts where any of the invincible battalions of Buonaparte made their appearance?—by a government whose friendship has proved so baneful and ruinous to so many powerful Princes, and covered with mourning and desolation the immense countries situated between the fertile banks of the Adige, and the frozen lakes of Bohemia?—by a government, lastly, which has so long endeavoured to erect the throne of tyranny upon the spoils and tombs of all other nations, and which of late years, has not even shrunk, in the face of the whole world, to adopt, as a basis of its machiavelian system of politics, the plan of perpetual war; a plan at which humanity shudders; a plan which posterity will record and hand down to our remotest descendants, as a memorable monument of the ferocity and barbarity to which egotism and a thirst for monopoly can precipitate a nation which lents its ear to no voice, but that of its arrogant and unnatural avarice?—Generous men of Lima! Let us fling far from us, with that contempt which they so well deserve, those infamous proclamations, with which the English General pretends to surprise the innate fidelity of our countrymen, who inhabit the banks of the river Plata. Let us look upon them as an insult to our honour, as an attempt against our happiness, and a plan directed to the destruction of our native land.—Merchants! the same men, who now pretend to have possessed themselves of Buenos Ayres, solely with a view of protecting our commerce, are the same who have precipitated it into a state of ruin, so prejudicial to your useful speculations, and to which you see it reduced. They are the same who commenced the present hostilities, by capturing three of the King's frigates, and blowing up another. They are the same who seized upon your defenceless ships peaceably navigating the seas, under a confidence that the Spanish flag, which they displayed in the air, would protect them against all injuries from a nation with which we were not then at war. A general indignation was manifested by all the Cabinets of Europe; but even this was insufficient to induce those avaricious and cruel islanders to restore the treasures which they had so unjustly taken, with the blood of so many innocent victims.—"Spaniards! That perfidious nation which now pretends to appear to the inhabitants of Buenos Ayres, as of all others, the most humane, is the same which, not six years since, sent a squadron and an army before Cadiz, at a time when the plague reigned within its walls, spreading horror and destruction. The English Admiral, who, from his cabin windows, could feast his eyes with the spectacle of mountains of corpses, yet unburied, and the gloomy light of the funeral piles, yet had the courage to challenge our valiant chief to surrender, or to prepare himself to suffer all the rigours of the war. The commander of a Moorish corsair, having fallen in with a convoy, carrying victuals and medicines, at the expence of the Pope, to the city of Marseilles, then infested by destructive plague, not only refrained from capturing those ships, but spontaneously convoyed them to the port of their destination; and the English Admiral, on a similar occasion, threw balls and shells into Cadiz, with an intent of reducing it to a heap of ruins.—Spaniards! Those who now publish a law at Buenos Ayres, enjoining slaves to obey their masters, are the same who fomented, and still continue to encourage, in the island of St. Domingó, the most atrocious rebellion recorded in the annals of nations. We have all witnessed that, while the sanguinary Dessalines, at the head of innumerable bands of assassins, marched along the coasts, with the murdering steel in one hand, and the incendiary torch in the other, with fire and sword, spreading desolation, destruction, and death wheresoever he went, an English squadron vigorously blockaded the capital, in order that no one solitary victim might escape the African fury.—Indians! You who are such interesting objects of the tender care of our most amiable monarch! That nation, which has taken possession of Buenos Ayres, has ever treated the Aborigines of America and Asia with the most inhuman cruelty. When, in the course of the last century, they found it impracticable, by force of arms, to subjugate the brave inhabitants of the Floridas, they concluded a specious peace, and, during that peace, regaled them with poisoned liquors and clothes, which caused death without number. Their East India Company has already extirpated the greatest number of the mild inhabitants of Malabar, Bengal, and Coromandel, and would extirpate them all by one single blow, if they re-

quired not their labour in the manufactories of their richest stuffs. That terrible famine is still recent in our memory, when millions of Indians perished, and which being foreseen by the English factories, they timely stored all the rice, and other provisions, which the scanty harvest of that year had yielded! Indians! wheresoever the English nation has gained a footing, your's has been enslaved, reduced, and destroyed without mercy.—All you people, inhabitants of Peru! let us, on this important occasion, display all our loyalty and courage. Let us speedily wash away the foul stain cast upon the arms of Spain by the surrender of Buenos Ayres. Let us instantly fly to arms, in the defence of our holy faith, and of our beloved sovereign; and let us plunge into the deep currents of the river La Plate those outcasts of smugglers and pirates, who having by surprise possessed themselves of one of the most interesting parts of America, diffident of the power of their arms, and in dread of our just vengeance, now attempt, by means of the detestable artifices of seduction, to induce us to forego the performance of our most sacred and inviolable duties, and to turn deaf ears to the pathetic and penetrating voice with which our country now calls upon us for assistance.

COMMERCIAL REGULATIONS IN ST. DOMINGO.—The Council of State, upon the proposition of the President and Generalissimo of the Land and Sea Forces of the Island of Hayti, enacts the following law:

Art. 1. from the first of July next, the duty of ten per cent. laid by the 1st article of the decree of the 2d of September, 1806, is and shall be suspended upon the exportation of sugar, cotton, and cocoa. It shall only be retained upon coffee. 3. It shall hereafter be lawful for vessels of every description, foreigners or others, freely to export sugar, cotton, and cocoa; upon which article it is forbidden to exact any duty whatever. 3. The duty of one-fourth, imposed upon the produce raised by the farmers of the State, by the 5th article of the decree relating to the mode of renting the national domains of the 22d December, 1794, shall be hereafter abolished. 4. The farmers of the State shall be subjected to no other charges than the payment of the rent of their farms. 5. The superintendant-General of the Finances is strictly enjoined to carry the above into execution.—Done at the Cape, the 20th June, 1807, 4th year of independence.—A. Vernet, Jean Phillipi Daux, Juge Fleury, Maguy, Secretary, Toussaint Brave, Raphael Manuel, Paul Romain, Chairman, Martial Bresse, Jean Baptiste. We, the President and Generalissimo of the land and sea forces of the state of Hayti, have sanctioned and do hereby sanction the present law, and direct, that the seal of the state shall be thereunto affixed, and that the same be published and carried into execution throughout the territory of Hayti. Given at the Palace at the Cape, 21st June, 1807, 4th year of Independence. HENRY CHRISTOPHE.

AMERICAN VESSELS.——*The following Letter has been transmitted to Ireland and circulated there:*—

Whitehall, 23d July, 1807.—My Lord,—I have the honour to transmit to your Grace the copy of a notice given by the Commissioners of the Customs to the merchants concerned in the trade with the United States of America, and to the masters of all American vessels, informing them, that according to a determination of the Lords of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, ships being American property, but not the built of America, or condemned as prize within the United States, sailing under sea letters, cannot be considered as American vessels, and consequently entitled to import into this kingdom, under the 37th Geo. III. cap. 97, which Act was continued until the 1st June, 1807, by the 46th of his Majesty, cap. 16, and the regulations contained therein, directed by his Majesty's Order in Council, dated 27th May, 1807, to be duly observed until other provision should be made; and directing the officers of that revenue to conform to the above determination of their Lordships, so far as they were or might be respectively concerned; and I have to request, that your Grace would give directions for promulgating the same among the merchants in Ireland concerned in the trade with the United States.—At the same time, in order to prevent inconvenience to the merchants from the said determination not having been sooner made known to them, I beg leave to recommend to your Grace to give directions for admitting to entry such American ships of the above description as may arrive in the ports of Ireland prior to the 31st of Oct., after which day the rule that ships being American property, but not of the built of America, and sailing under sea letters, should not be considered as entitled to import under the Act 37th Geo. III. cap. 97. should be invariably adhered to. I have the honour to be, &c. &c.—HAWKESBURY.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had: sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall.